



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,819	02/22/2002	Edward O. Clapper	ITL.0694US (P13225)	3076
21906	7590	03/22/2007	EXAMINER	
TROP PRUNER & HU, PC 1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750 HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631			ANWAH, OLISA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/081,819	CLAPPER, EDWARD O.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Olisa Anwah	2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/4/2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-8, 10, 15-22, 24 and 31-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9,11-14,23,25-30 and 38-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 9, 11, 12, 14, 23, 25-28 and 39-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodnar et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,658,268 (hereinafter Bodnar) combined with Smith, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0174110 (hereinafter Smith) and Albal et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0147518 (hereinafter Albal) in further view of Stogel, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0159574 (hereinafter Stogel).

Regarding claim 9, a system comprising:

a personal-use device (see unit 20 from Figure 1A) that is standalone, portable, and separate from a telephone (see unit 30 from Figure 1A) and another personal-use device (see desktop personal computer from column 2), the standalone device

Art Unit: 2614

including an interface to connect said standalone device to a telephone line and including another interface to connect said standalone device to the other personal-use device, the standalone, portable device having:

a processor;

a storage coupled to said processor to store a first database with a plurality of records, each containing a telephone number, a name, and other information; and

an application stored in said storage to enable said processor to access the telephone number of a second party to an ongoing telephone call, search said first database for a record containing the telephone number, and display a name and telephone number on the standalone, portable device (see column 13, line 60 through line 10 of column 14).

Still on the issue of claim 9, Bodnar fails to show that if the record is not found in the first database, said application to enable said processor to automatically initiate a search for information relating to said telephone number on a second, remotely located database, and to display information obtained from said second database on said standalone, portable device. Regardless, Smith discloses this feature (see Figure 2). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bodnar with the method for maintaining remotely accessible information taught by Smith. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by providing an integrated solution such that information on each device remains available for use in other devices in a convenient, transparent manner as suggested by Bodnar (see column 2).

Further regarding claim 9, the combination of Bodnar and Smith fails to show the information obtained from the second database is displayed on the standalone, portable device during the ongoing call. All the same, Albal discloses this feature (see paragraph 0021). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Bodnar and Smith with the method of delivering caller identification information disclosed by Albal. This modification would have improved the system's user friendliness by allowing the user to know the name of the caller before choosing to answer the phone call as suggested by Bodnar (see column 14).

Again on the issue of claim 9, the combination of Bodnar, Smith and Albal fails to disclose that if information is not

found in said second database, said application to enable said processor to automatically initiate a search for the information on a third database, remotely located database, said third database other than said second database. The combination of Bodnar, Smith and Albal also fails to teach displaying other information associated with said record on the standalone, portable device. All the same, Stogel discloses these features (see Figures 2 and 3). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Bodnar, Smith and Albal with displaying other information associated with said record on the standalone, portable device and the feature that if information is not found in said second database, said application to enable said processor to automatically initiate a search for the information on a third database, said third database other than said second database as taught by Stogel (see Figures 2 and 3). This modification would have improved the system's convenience by synchronizing distributed databases that may be used by a subscriber as suggested by Stogel (see paragraph 0009).

Regarding claim 11, see Figure 2 of Smith.

Regarding claim 12, see Figure 2 of Smith.

As per claim 14, the base references do not show the storage stores a sequential listing of telephone numbers of outgoing telephone calls and caller identification information for incoming telephone calls. However, Stogel discloses this limitation (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the base references wherein the storage stores a sequential listing of telephone numbers of outgoing telephone calls and caller identification information for incoming telephone calls as taught by Stogel. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by synchronizing distributed databases that may be used by a subscriber as suggested by Stogel (see paragraph 0009).

Regarding claim 23, Bodnar discloses a method comprising: receiving in a standalone, battery-powered, and transportable device (see unit 20 from Figure 1A) a search query for information associated with a second party during a telephone call, the device separate from a telephone (see unit 30 from Figure 1A) and a database (see desktop personal computer from column 2) and separately connectable to a telephone line (see Figure 1A) and the database (see column 2); and

obtaining the information from the device if the information is present in the device (see column 13, line 60 through line 10 of column 14).

With further respect to claim 23, Bodnar fails to teach searching at least the database for the information if the information is not present in the device. Regardless, Smith discloses this feature (see Figure 2). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bodnar with the method for maintaining remotely accessible information taught by Smith. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by providing an integrated solution such that information on each device remains available for use in other devices in a convenient, transparent manner as suggested by Bodnar (see column 2).

Further regarding claim 23, the combination of Bodnar and Smith fails to show providing the information to the device from the database to display the information on the device during the telephone call. All the same, Albal discloses this feature (see paragraph 0021). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2614

further modify the combination of Bodnar and Smith with the method of delivering caller identification information disclosed by Albal. This modification would have improved the system's user friendliness by allowing the user to know the name of the caller before choosing to answer the phone call as suggested by Bodnar (see column 14).

Again on the issue of claim 23, the combination of Bodnar, Smith and Albal does not disclose the database is the database of a personal computer. All the same, Stogel shows this feature (see Figure 1). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Bodnar, Smith and Albal with the personal computer of Stogel. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by providing connectivity to various devices as suggested by Stogel (see Figure 1).

Regarding claim 25, from Bodnar see column 13, line 60 through line 10 of column 14.

Regarding claim 26, from Bodnar see column 13, line 60 through line 10 of column 14.

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 27, see column 11 of Bodnar

As per claim 28, the base references do not show storing the telephone call in a call history in the device while the telephone call is in progress. However, Stogel discloses this limitation (see Figures 2 and 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the base references wherein the storage stores a sequential listing of telephone numbers of outgoing telephone calls and caller identification information for incoming telephone calls as taught by Stogel. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by synchronizing distributed databases that may be used by a subscriber as suggested by Stogel (see paragraph 0009).

Regarding claim 39, see column 11 of Bodnar

Regarding claim 40, see column 11 of Bodnar.

Regarding claim 41, see column 9 of Bodnar.

Regarding claim 42, see Figure 1A of Bodnar.

Regarding claim 43, from Bodnar see column 13, line 60 through line 10 of column 14.

Regarding claim 44, see Figure 1A of Bodnar.

Regarding claim 45, from Bodnar see column 13, line 60
through line 10 of column 14.

Regarding claim 46, from Bodnar see column 13, line 60
through line 10 of column 14.

Regarding claim 47, see column 10 of Bodnar.

Regarding claim 48, see Figure 1A of Bodnar.

3. Claim 13, 29, 30, 49, 50, 51, 53 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodnar combined with Smith, Albal and Stogel in further view of Suzuki, U.S. Patent No. 2001/0027098 (hereinafter Suzuki).

On the issue of claim 13, the combination of Bodnar, Smith, Albal and Stogel fails to teach the storage stores a user preference table that indicates a preferred search hierarchy among a plurality of databases. Nonetheless, Suzuki discloses this feature (see paragraph 0072). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Bodnar, Smith, Albal and Stogel with the table of Suzuki. This modification would have improved the

Art Unit: 2614

system's convenience by allowing the searchable databases to be specified in advance as suggested by Suzuki (see paragraph 0072).

Claim 29 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 13.

Regarding claim 30, see Figure 2 of Smith.

Regarding claim 49, Bodnar discloses a portable, standalone, personal-use device (see unit 20 from Figure 1A) comprising:

a processor having a memory;

a local database coupled to said processor and to store records containing telephone numbers, names, and other information;

a search engine to run on said processor and to search said database for a record containing a telephone number of a second party to an ongoing telephone call;

a display coupled to the processor to display information obtained from said local database, the information obtained from the local database to be displayed while said call is in progress; and

Art Unit: 2614

a housing to house said processor, database, search engine, said housing to enable viewing of said display (see column 13, line 60 through line 10 of column 14).

Further regarding claim 49, Bodnar does not teach the device includes a search initiator to run on said processor and to initiate a search for information associated with the second party on an external, remote database if the search engine does not find a record containing the telephone number; wherein the housing houses the search initiator. Regardless, Smith discloses this feature (see Figure 2). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bodnar with the method for maintaining remotely accessible information taught by Smith. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by providing an integrated solution such that information on each device remains available for use in other devices in a convenient, transparent manner as suggested by Bodnar (see column 2).

Still on the issue of claim 49, the combination of Bodnar and Smith does not clearly show that the information obtained from the external, remote database is displayed while said call

Art Unit: 2614

is in progress. All the same, Albal discloses this feature (see paragraph 0021). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Bodnar and Smith with the method of delivering caller identification information disclosed by Albal. This modification would have improved the system's user friendliness by allowing the user to know the name of the caller before choosing to answer the phone call as suggested by Bodnar (see column 14).

Again on the subject of claim 49, the combination of Bodnar, Smith and Albal fails to disclose that the device comprises instructions stored in memory to indicate a search for said search initiator is said initiator is to initiate a search of a plurality of other external, remote databases for information. Regardless, Stogel discloses this feature (see Figures 2 and 3). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Bodnar, Smith and Albal with the instructions of Stogel. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by synchronizing distributed databases that may be used by a subscriber as suggested by Stogel (see paragraph 0009).

Still on the matter of claim 49, the combination of Bodnar, Smith, Albal and Stogel does not show that the instructions are a user preference table that indicates a search path for the search initiator. Yet, Suzuki discloses this feature (see paragraph 0072). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Bodnar, Smith, Albal and Stogel with the table of Suzuki. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the searchable databases to be specified in advance as suggested by Suzuki (see paragraph 0072).

Regarding claim 50, see Figure 1A of Bodnar.

Regarding claim 51, see column 4 of Bodnar.

Regarding claim 53, see column 10 of Bodnar.

Regarding claim 54, see column 10 of Bodnar.

4. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodnar combined with Smith, Albal and Stogel in further view of Fujiwara, U.S. Patent No. 6,270,271 (hereinafter Fujiwara).

As per claim 38, nowhere does the combination of Bodnar, Smith, Albal and Stogel show a printer is housed in the portable

Art Unit: 2614

device. Nonetheless, Fujiwara discloses this limitation (see abstract). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Bodnar, Smith, Albal and Stogel with the printer of Fujiwara. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to obtain a print output at any time and anywhere as suggested by Fujiwara (see column 7).

5. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodnar combined with Smith, Albal and Stogel in further view of Bodnar, U.S. Patent No. 6,686,931 (hereinafter '931 patent).

As per claim 52, the base references fail to show a sort records bar to sort displayed information in accordance with a selectable sort option, said sort records bar other than a bar displayed on said display. Regardless, the '931 patent discloses this feature (see column 14). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the base references with a sort records bar to sort displayed information in accordance with a selectable sort option, said sort records bar other than a bar displayed on said display as taught by the '931 patent. This modification would have improved the system

Art Unit: 2614

convenience by enabling a user to conveniently access information as suggested by Bodnar (see column 2).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 571-272-7533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 571-273-8300 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

Art Unit: 2614

OA

Olisa Anwah
Patent Examiner
March 2, 2007



FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600